

Chair:
Councillor George Meehan

Deputy Chair:
Councillor Lorna Reith

INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This report covers matters considered by the Executive at our meeting on 21 November 2006. For ease of reference the Report is divided into the Executive portfolios.
- 1.2 We trust that this Report will be helpful to Members in their representative role and facilitate a fruitful dialogue between the Executive and all groups of Councillors. These reports are a welcome opportunity for the Executive on a regular basis to present the priorities and achievements of the Executive to Council colleagues for consideration and comment. The Executive values and encourages the input of fellow members.

ITEMS OF REPORT

Organisational Development and Performance

3. PROGRAMME HIGHLIGHT REPORT – SEPTEMBER 2006

- 3.1 The Council will be aware that the programme is the vehicle for the delivery of corporately significant projects and projects that were key political priorities. It underpinned the Council's corporate planning process, ensuring that the projects undertaken reflected and helped to deliver Community Strategy and corporate priorities.
- 3.2 The report provided an opportunity to monitor, challenge and support the Council's key projects to ensure that they finished on time, to budget and deliver the outcomes for the community. We considered a report which provided details of all the Council's corporately significant projects, covering the period up to the end of September 2006.
- 3.3 We were informed that a key driver in developing the programme structure had been to improve financial oversight of the Council's key corporate projects. Accordingly, projects were required to report detailed financial information in their project highlight reports each month. In receiving the report we noted that the key areas of financial concern as at the end of September had been –
 - Primary Schools – Due to concerns about the current programme and finances, Primary Schools Capital Projects were to be the subject of a separate report to the Chief Executives Management Board and to us advising on a revised three-year capital programme for the Children's Service.
 - Children's Centres – Further work was required to ensure the detailed spending plan for delivery of the new centres could be funded within the budget available and in the year the funding was available;
 - Procurement – This project had a target of £2m of savings, equally split over 2005/06 and 2006/07. Only £1.2m had been identified with projects implemented, so there would be a shortfall of £0.8million against the target in 2006/07. This was reported to us within the budget monitoring report.

N.B. These highlight reports reflected the position of some of the Council's corporately significant projects as at 30 September 2006 and might have changed in the meantime.

4. THE COUNCIL'S PERFORMANCE – SEPTEMBER 2006

- 4.1 We considered a report which set out the routine financial and performance monitoring for September 2006 in the new balanced scorecard format.
- 4.2 In summary the balanced scorecard showed that for the excellent service perspective 69% of indicators were on target or close to the end of year target at the end September. For 24 of the 36 (67%) customer focus measures, performance targets were being met or close to being met. For financial health 22 of the 31 measures achieved amber or green status meaning for 71% of indicators performance levels were achieving target or being maintained at an acceptable level. Our organisational development /capacity indicators including staff survey results showed that for 17 of the 18 (94%) measures, performance was at or close to expected levels. Overall 72% of indicators were achieving or close to achieving target. In addition 69% of indicators had maintained or improved performance since the end of last year.
- 4.3 The scorecard appendix also included for the first time some estimated top quartile data so that progress could be assessed not only against the targets we set but in terms of how we compared with others and how close we were to attaining what we ultimately were aiming to achieve.
- 4.3 With regard to finance monitoring, in summary, based on the September position, the revenue budget showed a balanced position. Net variations of £1.1 million made up of the cost pressures in Social Services budgets of £2.4 million, Asylum Seekers of £0.9 million, and underspends of £2 million on homelessness and £0.2million in Chief Executives Service, would be offset by a proposed virement from the service development / contingency for 2006/07.
- 4.4 We also approved a number of virements. Under the Constitution, certain virements are key decisions. Key decisions are:
- for revenue, any virement which resulted in change in a directorate cash limit of more than £250,000; and
 - for capital, any virement which resulted in the change of a programme area of more than £250,000.

The virements approved are set out in the following table:

Period	Service	Key	Amount current year (£'000)	Full year Amount (£'000)	Description
6	Chief Executives, Housing,	Rev*	3,300		Asylum Seekers £0.9m Social Services £2.4m Adults & O.People

	Social Services, NSR				Total £3,3m Met from homelessness underspend of £2 million, Chief Exec £0.2m and from service development contingency £1.1m
6	Chief Executives	Cap*	500		Bernie Grant Centre – additional contribution to meet higher capital costs to be funded from LPSA grant; paragraphs 12.4 to 12.10 refer.
6	Social Services	Rev	37	37	Transfer of budgets from Older People and Adults for two policy and planning assistants within the Policy and Performance Team.
6	Environment	Rev*	626		Budget revised to reflect Planning and delivery grant (PDG) allocation.
6	Children's, Finance	Rev	10	10	Transfer of non staff costs for Children's Finance Team to Corporate Finance
6	Housing	Cap*	-1,144		Reversal of carry forward from 05/06
6	Housing	Cap	42		Additional budget for Recycling Estates (£30k) and for Booster Pumps (£12k) that are funded from monies received.
6	Chief Executives	Rev*	413		SSCF Neighbourhood element monies
6	Environment	Cap*	-1,000		Revision of 06/07 spend profile re Haringey Heartlands Spine Road project.
6	Environment	Cap*	621		Reallocation of £579k of TFL funded schemes to other TFL schemes in our budget and the balance of £42k is new TFL monies.
6	Environment	Cap*	545		Additional budget for Finsbury Park HLF project that is largely funded from HLF monies and the balance of £160k from capital receipts. The capital receipts have been generated due to lower capital spend requirements on the Lordship Rec project (£100k) and on the Parks and Open Spaces project (£60k).
6	Environment	Rev	120		Greenways allocation funded by TFL monies. Highgate Station to Alexandra Palace Station (£60k) and Finsbury Park to White Hart Lane (£60k).
6	HRA		167		Reallocation of managed budgets for grounds maintenance, waste management and pest control.
6	HRA	*	1,913		- pest control “
6	HRA	*	1,233		- waste management “
6	HRA	*	-3,313		- grounds maintenance “
6	HRA		3		- central recharges “ Homes for Haringey proposes to fund

					various environmental works from the management fee budget. - pest control “
6	HRA		60		- waste management “
6	HRA		70		- grounds maintenance “
6	HRA		45		- landscaping works “
6	HRA		-178		- management fee – retained budgets
6	HRA	*	-732		Leasehold income - an over-recovery of leaseholder income of £732k is forecast. This reflects the recovery of leaseholders’ insurance costs. This is offset by a matching overspend in the Retained Budget where the costs have been incurred.
6	HRA	*	1,500		Reallocation of the provision of bad debts from leaseholder income.

N.B. The performance report reflected the position at 30 September 2006 and might have changed in the meantime.

Children and Young People

5. COUNCIL’S OWN PROPOSAL FOR THE NEW SCHOOL IN HARINGEY

- 5.1 We reported to the Council on 17 July 2006, that we had agreed that statutory consultation and the competition processes for the new secondary school in Haringey Heartlands under the Education Act 2005 could begin. The first phase of the consultation had finished on 11 August 2006. On 4 September 2006 Statutory Notices had been published inviting bids for the new school. The Notice invited bids from independent promoters to be received by the Council no later than 4 January 2007. On 3 October 2006 a meeting had been arranged by representatives of the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) for interested parties and potential sponsors at The Decorium, in Wood Green. Representatives of the Council had discussed why a new school was needed, listened to comments and answered questions.
- 5.2 We have now considered a further report which set out a Council proposal on which we were invited to comment. The paper set out the Council’s bid for a mixed comprehensive community school, to open in September 2010 with specialisms in visual arts and media. Additional specialisms would be in areas of SEN (Autism) and vocational diplomas. The new school would open with six forms of entry and grow until it eventually had eight forms of entry. It will be an 11-16 school, with a roll of 1080 when at full capacity plus an additional 25 places in a special unit for students with autism.
- 5.3 We report that, having noted that the primary objective of the new school would be to advance the best interests of children in Haringey that the outcome of the competition process would be on the basis of merit and that details of potential independent promoters would be available after 4 January 2007, we granted approval to the Council’s proposal for the establishment of a community secondary school.

6. LEARNER SUPPORT FUND (LSF) POLICY

- 6.1 We considered a report which advised us that all providers of a Learner Support Fund (LSF) were required to have a written policy on how the Fund was allocated, including an assessment of learners' income and a procedure for learners to appeal if they were refused funding. These policies had to be made widely available and had to apply principles of equality and diversity.
- 6.2 We noted that the Learning and Skills Council gave Haringey a LSF of £10,660, of which 5% (£533) could be applied to offset administrative costs leaving £10,127 to be allocated to those who met the criteria and applied on a first come first served basis. In the last academic year of the 36 applications received, 27 totalling £7,337 had been approved. Two were still pending. The highest payment made was £400 and the lowest was £60, with an average of £253.
- 6.3 We noted that approval of applications would be on a first come first served basis and, as the funds were limited, only those applications who met the criteria, i.e. those living in the Borough who were in receipt of Education Maintenance Allowance (EMA), Free School Meals (FSM), or who had a medical or learning difficulty would be considered. In order to minimise the risk of fraud, applicants would be required to provide their EMA for the year in which they are applying. Their FSM authorisation letter was also required. These two documents carried proof of address as applicants must be resident in Haringey. Applicants would also be asked to provide proof of purchase.
- 6.4 We report that we approved the Learner Support Fund policy as proposed and we delegated authority to the Director of the Children and Young People's Service in consultation with the Executive Member for Children and Young People to agree the Learner Support Fund policy in future years.

Social Services & Health

7. MAXIMISING HOUSEHOLD INCOME IN HARINGEY

- 7.1 In September 2002 we agreed a response to a Scrutiny Review of Benefit Take-Up which had made a number of recommendations to aid improving benefit take-up rates, particularly by improving strategic direction and co-ordination. These recommendations included that an anti-poverty strategy be developed for the Borough and that the Director of Social Services be made the corporate lead officer for income maximisation.
- 7.2 A Review of Advice Funding commissioned by the Council's Voluntary Sector Team published in March 2006 had found that there was "a huge and unmet need" for advice in Haringey. It made a number of recommendations to improve provision, including that consideration should be given to:
- developing an advice strategy with partner organisations;
 - developing a strategic planning and commissioning body with partner organisations;
 - providing greater support for voluntary sector capacity-building;
 - providing welfare rights training to appropriate Council staff; and

- tightening the Council's commissioning criteria to ensure value for money and to minimise capacity and competence issues amongst voluntary organisations commissioned to provide advice.
- 7.3 A study published in October 2006 by London Councils (formerly the Association of London Government) entitled 'Mapping London Voluntary Sector Child Poverty Related Activity' had found that there was a general need across London for all tiers of government to increase focus on the advice sector. Recommended measures included developing understanding and awareness of what services were in place, levelling out provision and making it more accessible, particularly to disadvantaged and vulnerable groups, and ensuring that an appropriate range of specialist advice was available.
- 7.4 In addition to the strategic advantages of improving benefit take-up identified in the Scrutiny Review of Benefit Take-Up, national research had also shown that:
- not only was benefits income mostly spent locally, but for every extra £100,000 spent at local shops and businesses an extra job was likely to be created within the local economy;
 - provision of debt advice to tenants (especially private sector tenants) could significantly reduce rates of property abandonment; and
 - increases in benefit income resulted in better physical and mental health both 6 and 12 months later.
- 7.5 In our response to the Scrutiny Review of Benefit Take-Up we stressed that it should not be attempted to write a comprehensive "anti-poverty strategy" addressing all the underlying determinants of poverty, because this would inevitably involve duplication of various existing Council and partnership strategies which already addressed different elements of these determinants. However, the absence of any such all-encompassing strategic document meant that:
- it might be hard to gain an overall understanding of the range of work carried out by the Council and partners which impacted upon poverty and social exclusion; and
 - there might not be consistent policy principles behind different initiatives stemming from different service areas.
- 7.6 We considered a report which proposed that the respective sets of recommendations from the Scrutiny Review of Benefit Take-Up and the Review of Advice Funding be taken forward through the development of a single 'income maximisation' strategy and action plan. This would fulfil our decision that a strategy on anti-poverty issues should be "strongly focused on practical action the Council can deliver organisationally and practically". We believe that this approach had the potential to make a significant impact on financial hardship in Haringey over the first three years of the lifespan of the Community Strategy. We noted that, in addition, officers were investigating future development of a broader strategic framework (as opposed to an actual strategy) for anti-poverty and social exclusion initiatives in Haringey which would have the potential to
- identify where gaps existed in current Council and partner activity in this area; and

- establish basic policy principles to inform all future activity.

- 7.7 However, we felt that any such strategic framework should be developed following the completion of the new Community Strategy in order to ensure synergy in further articulating the broad vision of the Council (and its partners) in relation to addressing poverty and social exclusion over the full 10-year lifespan of the new Community Strategy.
- 7.8 We report that we approved the development of a focused 'income maximisation' strategy and action plan to be taken forward as a project to be planned by January 2007, concentrating on improved co-ordination of activity in the areas of welfare rights services and advice provision. In so doing we noted that the development was dependent on ongoing resources being found through the Council's business planning process. We also agreed, in principle, that the future development of a strategic framework for all activity in Haringey which tackled poverty and social exclusion was to follow after the agreement of the new Community Strategy.

Housing

8. FORFEITURE PROCEEDINGS AGAINST RESIDENTIAL LEASEHOLDERS

- 8.1 The Council is the freeholder of and Homes for Haringey (HfH) manages about 4300 residential leasehold flats sold under the Right to Buy. HfH is responsible for collecting the leasehold service charges payable to the Council which may vary between relatively small debts for annual maintenance charges to more substantial debts in respect of the leaseholder contribution to major improvements.
- 8.2 HfH regularly takes County Court proceedings against individual leaseholders to recover unpaid leasehold service charges and once a County Court Judgement (CCJ) has been obtained it is often necessary to take enforcement proceedings to recover the debt. While various procedures are available, the most efficient and cost effective sanction is likely to be forfeiture proceedings. This means that if the debtor fails or refuses to pay the CCJ debt the Council can ask the Court to order that the lease be forfeit and the property returned to Council ownership. The Council's standard Right-to-Buy lease already provides for forfeiture in these circumstances which is a standard procedure in the private sector but which the Council has not hitherto used. The Home Ownership Team (HOT) at HfH has introduced numerous schemes to assist leaseholders who cannot pay.
- 8.3 We report that we approved a policy of taking legal proceedings to forfeit the lease as an enforcement procedure of last resort against residential leaseholders who failed to pay leasehold service charges.

Enterprise and Regeneration

9. DRAFT STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

- 9.1 We considered a report the purpose of which was to seek our approval for the draft

Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) to go out to consultation with the public and general consultation bodies in accordance with the legal requirement. The draft Statement set out the Council's vision and standards for involving the community and other stakeholders in the preparation, revision and alteration of Local Development Documents which will form part of the Local Development Framework and consideration of planning applications.

- 9.2 We noted that, depending on the comments received from the public and general consultation bodies, the draft Statement of Community Involvement might be amended in the light of comments received. A Statement of Community Involvement would be submitted to the Government Office for London in Spring 2007 for examination by a planning inspector.
- 9.3 We report that we approved the draft Statement of Community Involvement for consultation with the public and general consultation bodies and that we delegated to the Assistant Director (Planning, Enforcement Policy and Performance) in consultation with the Executive Member for Enterprise and Regeneration authority to approve any changes prior to public consultation and publish a public notice of consultation.

Environment and Conservation

10. TOTTENHAM HALE CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE EXTENSION AND STONELEIGH ROAD PAY AND DISPLAY SCHEME – REPORT OF STATUTORY CONSULTATION

- 10.1 We considered a report which summarized the feedback from the Statutory Consultation process carried out in February/March 2006 in connection with the proposed extension to the Tottenham Hale Compulsory Parking Zone (CPZ). We noted that the proposed extension was generally supported by the residents within the proposed area with the Council receiving a majority in support (65%) for the proposals during the informal stage of Consultation. Concerns were expressed during the Statutory Consultation predominantly by the Tottenham Traders Association regarding how the scheme would operate. However, we were informed that the concerns raised were based mainly around the operational times which were supported when the original scheme was implemented and the tariffs set.
- 10.2 We noted that the proposal was in accordance with the statutory legal provisions and we considered that measures designed to discourage the use of the private car for non-essential journeys would reduce congestion and would have a positive effect on residents and businesses within the area. Given the feedback of Statutory Consultation and taking into account the objections received, the report also recommended the extension of the Tottenham Hale CPZ and the implementation of pay and display parking along Stoneleigh Road.
- 10.3 We report that, having noted the feedback of the Statutory Consultation process and in particular the objections received, we agreed the reasons for providing parking controls, authorized the Council officers to make the Traffic Management Order and take all the steps necessary for the extension of the Tottenham Hale and the introduction of the Stoneleigh Road pay and display scheme. We also agreed that residents of the affected area should be notified of our decision by letter.

Crime and Community Safety

11. FINAL HATE CRIME AND HARASSMENT STRATEGY

11.1 We considered a report which advised us that in 2005 Middlesex University had been commissioned to undertake research on the nature and extent of hate crime and harassment in Haringey. This highlighted some of the weaknesses in the Safer Communities Partnership's response to the issue including the need for better co-ordination across agencies; the need for a shared definition of hate crime and harassment and the need to improve the confidence of communities that reports of these incidents were taken seriously and dealt with appropriately. The report proposed a strategy which addressed these findings.

11.2 The Strategy acknowledged key national and local agendas including:

- The Government Respect Action Plan for combating anti-social behaviour which stressed the importance of cohesive communities and asked local authorities to monitor the extent to which people feel they were treated with respect.
- The Community Cohesion Agenda which encouraged breaking down barriers between different ethnic and religious groups

11.3 Priorities for Action: The strategic priorities outlined in the document were defined under five headings. However, we noted that they did overlap and in some cases were dependent on each other. The strategy document provided more detail including SMART targets and clear responsibilities:

1) Improving Community Cohesion:

Encouraging the voluntary and community sector (VCS) to work with different communities and promote joint working within the VCS and with the Council, Police and other partners. This includes new funding guidance from the Voluntary Sector Grants Department and co-ordinating the work of this Strategy with developments for a Community Cohesion Strategy.

2) Long Term Prevention Work:

Increase social intolerance to hate crime and harassment amongst young people and the wider community. This includes building on work in schools to raise awareness that hate crime and harassment is not tolerated and to promote social disapproval of the issue. This work also includes action to challenge intolerance of difference.

3) Improving Intelligence:

Improving the collection and analysis of hate crime and harassment data between the Police, Council's Community Safety Team, VCS, Anti-Social Behaviour Action Team and other relevant partners. It also concerns improving front line agencies' connection with communities to increase community intelligence.

4) Encouraging Reporting of Hate Crime and Harassment:

This is about increasing awareness about hate crime reporting methods, publicising the benefits of reporting and improving the Borough's capacity to capture reports and respond suitably through training.

5) Responding to Hate Crime and Harassment:

Improving the co-ordination of relevant partners' work in dealing with perpetrators and supporting victims. This includes joint mechanisms for sharing information and making referrals as well as improving front line staff's capacity and understanding of where to refer victims and how to deal sensitively with reports through training.

- 11.4 We report, for information, that we endorsed and supported the proposed approach, priorities and actions and agreed and supported the implementation of the strategy.

12. YOUTH CRIME REDUCTION STRATEGY

12.1 The Council will be aware that Haringey was one of eleven Boroughs asked by the Government Office for London (GOL) to produce a Youth Crime Reduction Strategy for 2002-2005. This strategy was instrumental in setting up services in the Prevention Team within the YOS. The Scrutiny Review – Reducing Re-offending by Young People recommended that a Corporate Youth Crime Prevention Strategy be developed. The strategy described existing services and defines strategic aims for 2006-2008.

12.2 We have now considered a report and accompanying Strategy which defined 5 strategic aims:

1. To build on and improve partnership working.
2. To reduce re-offending and tackling persistent and high risk offenders.
3. To reduce child and youth victimisation.
4. Targeted crime prevention and reduction and early intervention.
5. To improve consultation and participation with young people.

12.3 In agreeing the Strategy we noted that achievement of these aims would involve adopting a multi-disciplinary approach working in conjunction with other key partners and agencies and that the aims would be reviewed regularly by the Youth Crime Reduction Steering Group with oversight by the YOS Partnership Board.

Leader

13. DRAFT EQUALITY SCHEME

13.1 We considered a report which sought our approval to introduce a generic Equality Scheme which would bring the duties under the various UK anti-discrimination legislation such as on race, gender, disability, religion or belief, age and sexuality under a single strategic policy and operational framework. We noted that when finalised and adopted, the Equality Scheme would signal a move towards a unified and integrated approach to equalities work in Haringey. We also noted that the Scheme had to be introduced by 4 December 2006 to coincide with the coming into force of the Disability Public Duties.

13.2 The adoption of the Equality Scheme would have a number of policy implications for the Council -

- It would confirm that Haringey had a generic and integrated approach to equal opportunity, which does not recognise a hierarchy of inequality.
- It would avoid the need to develop a separate equality scheme for each of the strands to which they were public duties.
- At grassroots level, it had the potential to bring together the various equality organisations and promote joint working between them.
- It would provide the Council with a full picture of the equalities agenda as it had developed in last few years and its wider linkage with social inclusion and community cohesion.
- It would provide a single strategic document that would govern equalities work in Haringey and provide the basis for assessing performance that covered a broad spectrum of equality, inclusion and social cohesion issues.

13.3 The Scheme, in its final form would be the product of an extensive consultation process which would involve a wide range of groups in Haringey, including strategic partners, Council staff and organisations covering the six equality strands covered in the Scheme. These would include among others:

- Council staff;
- The Local Strategic Partnership;
- The Race Equality Joint Consultative Committee;
- Haringey Women's Forum;
- Haringey Disabilities Consortium;
- Haringey Faith Forum;
- Haringey Age Concern;
- Gypsies and Irish Travellers;
- Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) Network.

13.4 We report that we approved the draft Equality Public Duties Scheme its potential implications for the Council and the consultation scheduled. We also agreed that the Scheme be introduced by 4 December 2006 to coincide with the Disabilities Public Duties coming into force on that date.

14. URGENT ACTION TAKEN IN CONSULTATION WITH EXECUTIVE MEMBERS

14.1 We were informed of the following actions taken by Directors under urgency procedures following consultation with Executive Members. Those items which contain exempt information are marked ♦

<p>Novation of the IT Customer Relationship Management (CRM) Contract from Serco Solutions Ltd. to Serco Ltd.</p>	<p>◆Approval to the novation of the IT CRM contract from Serco Solutions Ltd. to Serco Ltd. and to proceed to the Council’s sealing of the Novation Agreement.</p>
<p>Building Schools for the Future – Outline Business Case</p>	<p>Following discussions with Partnerships for Schools, approval to submission of a revised Outline Business Case seeking a grant of £178,782,000 (up from £165,159,610) from the Department for Education and Skills.</p>
<p>Appointment of Councillor to serve on the Hornsey Town Hall Community Partnership</p>	<p>Approval to the appointment of Councillor Gorrie to serve on the Hornsey Town Hall Community Partnership Board in place of Councillor Winskill.</p>

15. DELEGATED DECISIONS AND SIGNIFICANT ACTIONS – MAY 2006

15.1 We were informed of significant actions which involved expenditure of more than £50,000 taken by Directors under delegated powers. Those items which contain exempt information are marked ◆

Assistant Chief Executive Access

Extension to the Capgemini Technical Services contract for the development and support of the Siebel (CRM) application.

The Director of Children and Young People’s Service

Developing Further training opportunities to raise quality of nursery education - Agreed two new additional Assessor posts

Establishment Changes – Leaving Care Service - Agreed creation of two permanent posts for 18+care leavers

Director of Environmental Services

Haringey Cycle Training Contract - To award the contract for cycle training in the London Borough of Haringey to Cycle Training UK in the sum of £60,000.